

## REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in conjunction with a simultaneously filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and in response to the final Office Action dated April 26, 2007, which set a three-month period for response, making a response due by July 26, 2007, and with the initial two-month period for response expiring on June 26, 2007.

Claims 1, 4, and 6-10 are pending in this application.

In the final Office Action, claims 1, 4, and 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 4, and 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,051,880 to Hestily.

In the present amendment, the claims have been amended to address the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph, set forth on pages 2-4 of the final rejection.

With regard to the Examiner's question about the "motor housing" and the "housing" as recited in claim 1, the housing consists of separate elements as the motor housing. The motor housing cooperates with the housing in so far as the housing represents the general outer surface, but the motor housing is only a minor part of the housing, the one with the larger diameter, carrying the turbine wheel.

Regarding claim 10, the “grip region” is the area of the tool which the operator grips for manipulating the hand router. The Applicants believe the term “grip region” is self explanatory and that claim 10 does not require further limitation in this regard.

The Applicants have attempted to address every comment made by the Examiner with regard to the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, in the present amendment. The Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of these formal rejections.

Turning next to the new substantive grounds for rejection, the Applicants respectfully submit that the new reference to Hestily is not relevant, as it only discloses an electric power tool having an electric motor which drives the tool/router bit. Only a **blower** is formed on the top side of the motor which is proposed by the electric motor, as best shown in Fig. 5 of Hestily.

Hestily does not disclose or show a power tool driven by an air-turbine and operable by a vacuum cleaner for driving the tool/router. Hestily also does not disclose or show gratings for calming the air flowing in and out of the turbine. Likewise, Hestily does not provide any curved vanes that serve this purpose. The Applicants respectfully request clarification from the Examiner as to which elements in Hestily were considered in the final rejection to the “curved vanes” and “gratings” as defined in claim 1 of the present application.

The Applicants furthermore respectfully submit that Hestily is not a proper reference under 35 USC 102 pursuant to the guidelines set forth in the last paragraph of MPEP section 2131, where it is stated that “a claim is anticipated

only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”, and that “the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim”.

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4, and 6-10 as amended are patentable over the cited art. The Applicants further submit that this application stands in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

**/ Michael J. Striker /**

Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700